



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

---

### ΠΟΘΗ AND ΠΟΘΟΣ IN *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY* ANOTHER CHORIZONTIC FAILURE

In his discussion of these words in *Classical Philology*, XV, 387 ff., Professor Bolling admits only two meanings, a "strong emotion of longing or yearning," and "the want, the need, or the lack" of a thing. But between these two extremes there are, as for other Homeric words, other shades of meaning less strong than the first and stronger than the second. Especially there is the feeling the want of a thing, with no implication of intense regret, but only of dissatisfaction at, or the inconvenience of, finding a thing is not there as it used to be. In English we express this by the verb "to miss," but we appear to have no noun to correspond. Let us call it *x*. I feel quite sure that many will say that this nameless expression is a perfectly good equivalent for *ποθή* and *πόθος* in a number of the Homeric passages. But some Homeric students will really be at times, unlike Professor Bolling, at a loss to decide what the exact rendering in English should be.

As an example we may take his first and "typical" quotation, A 240, where Achilles says, ἦ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθή ἔξεται νῆας Ἀχαιῶν. Professor Bolling would translate, "the Achaeans shall yearn strongly for me." That is perhaps correct. Others would say that "shall miss me in the fight" or simply "shall wish me back" is enough, and *they* may be right. I incline to Professor Bolling's interpretation myself, but I do not share his perfect confidence. It is a matter for individual appreciation. But I would add that if, in the seven passages of the *Iliad* which Professor Bolling discusses, *ποθή* means, necessarily and by itself, "strong longing or yearning," it is strange that in *five* of them the poet requires to intensify the meaning by adding *μεγάλη*, *μέγα*, or *λίην*. Thus, in his second case, Z 362, Hector, away from the fight, referring to his men still on the field, says of them, οἱ μέγ' ἐμείο ποθὴν ἀπείντος ἔχουσιν. Where is the strong emotion? If it is present, it is indicated by *μέγα*, and *ποθή* is simply *x*. I think it will be allowed that a perfectly good translation is, "who very much, or to a great degree, miss, or have *x* of me." Many, I feel certain, would translate another of the lines, Ξ 368, κείνου δ' οὐ τι λίην ποθή ἔσσεται, "we shall not miss him so very much." There is no need to accept Professor Bolling's extreme interpretation.

But his great point is that *ποθή*, in five passages of the *Odyssey*, means "want, need, lack," and not, as in the *Iliad*, "strong yearning." Take then one of them, θ 414. Euryalus makes atonement for an insult by

giving Odysseus a sword, and it is in the hero's acknowledgment that the line occurs, *μηδέ τί τοι ξίφείος γε ποθή μετόπισθε γένοιτο | τούτου*. Professor Bolling's dictum gives us the rendering, "may you never be without this sword hereafter." But surely to tell a man whose sword you have accepted as a gift, and which you are girding *ἀμφ' ὤμοισι* to show your complete ownership, that you hope he will not hereafter "be minus" that sword, would be as absurd a reply as ever was perpetrated. The translation *must* be, "may you never hereafter miss, or have *x* of, this sword." Professor Bolling has apparently omitted to read the second line beginning with *τούτου*. In β 126 there is the same room for difference of opinion. There Antinous says of Penelope, *μέγα μὲν κλέος αὐτῇ | ποιεῖτ', αὐτὰρ σοί γε ποθὴν πολέος βιότοιο*. In place of "want" or "lack" for *ποθή*, why not "regret for," as Butcher and Lang render?

In the other three of the five passages Professor Bolling may be right, but I cannot say the same of all the three others in the *Odyssey* in which *πόθος* is said, like his *ποθή* in the *Iliad*, to express a strong yearning. That may be granted for λ 202 (Odysseus' mother's *πόθος* for her son), but not for ξ 144 (Eumaeus' *πόθος* for Odysseus), or δ 596 (Telemachus' *πόθος* for his home and parents). In these two cases there is not necessarily anything more than desire, and by that word in fact Butcher and Lang translate *πόθος*. Professor Bolling, in short, translates the words just as his theory requires, and ignores possible alternatives. But a discussion of the two words must reckon with these. In some of his passages we may allow he is correct and that there is no alternative, but even then the preponderance in his favor is, if it exists, not great, and he cannot reasonably require the uses in the one poem to be exactly equal in number and effect to those in the other. Certainly there is nothing in the facts to justify the tremendous conclusion which he announces.

But there is more to be said about the seven passages in the *Iliad*. The list is really much less formidable than it appears, for it is the fact, though Professor Bolling does not mention it, that three of them must rank as one. They contain a Homeric formula, and the three of them may be combined thus, | - - - (- ~ ~ -). *μεγάλη δὲ ποθή Δαναοῖσι(ν) (Πυλίοισιν) γένηται (τέτυκται, ἐτύχθη)*. An initial molossus or choriambus followed by a pause—sufficient to be indicated in our texts by punctuation—and also by a continuation of the line including *δέ, αὐτάρ, γάρ,* and the like, is very common in Homer, and *δέ* is the particle that is used most frequently. There are fifteen occurrences with *δέ* in A alone. That may be in part the explanation, as both *πόθος* and *ποθή* were at the poet's disposal, of the use of *ποθή* in that formula. *μέγας πόθος* would not be so easy to work in with *δέ* after the first foot and a half; *μεγάλη δὲ ποθή* suits perfectly. And further, it can be understood why the poet preferred *ποθή* to *πόθος*, in two of the remaining four passages of the *Iliad*, in the expression *ποθή ζέται* and *ποθή ἐσσεται*. *πόθος* would have given a sibilant assonance of

a kind which the poet, as it happens, does not like after the third dactyl. (I do not stop to suggest a reason.) There are several forms of sibilant assonance between two consecutive words, and the way of the poet with them is well worth studying in connection with the subject, never yet properly developed, of the pauses in the Homeric hexameter. The particular form we are concerned with is the commonest of all, or the least disliked, because, as the second syllable is long by position and has the ictus, the unpleasantness is not felt so much as in other classes, e.g., those of the types Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον or σὺ σώσον. But out of some four hundred and fifty instances in Homer of our particular form there are only, if my counting be correct, thirty-four after the third dactyl. By using ποθή the poet avoided the assonance.

For the reasons given I for one decline absolutely to admit that the distinction between the two forms is "clean-cut in the *Odyssey*," or that there is anything in the uses of πόθος and ποθή to make it impossible that the two poems are the work of one man.

A. SHEWAN

ST. ANDREWS  
SCOTLAND

# PLATON SYMPOSION 212E

Eine der Stellen, die den Herausgebern Platons besonders grosse Schwierigkeiten bereitet haben, ist *Symp.* 212E. Der trunkene Alcibiades ist zu später Stunde mit vielem Lärm ins Haus des Agathon eingedrungen. Er grüsst die versammelten Zechgenossen und gibt die Absicht seines Kommens kund:

Μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνυ σφόδρα δέξεσθε συμπότην ἢ ἀπίωμεν ἀναδίσσαντες μόνον Ἀγάθωνα, ἐφ' ᾧπερ ἡλθομεν; ἐγὼ γάρ τοι . . . χθές μὲν οὐχ οἷός τ' ἐγενόμην ἀφικέσθαι, νῦν δὲ ἤκω ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἔχων τὰς ταινίας, ἵνα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμῆς κεφαλῆς τὴν τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ καλλίστου κεφαλῇν . . . ἀναδήσω. ἄρα καταγελάσεσθέ μου ὡς μεθύοντος; ἐγὼ δέ, κὰν ὑμεῖς γελᾶτε, ὅμως εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω. ἀλλὰ μοι λέγετε αὐτόθεν ἐπὶ ῥήτοισι εἰσὶν ἡ μῆ; συμπίεσθε ἢ οὐ;

An der vorläufig freigelassenen, durch . . . bezeichneten Stelle stehen die Worte ἐὰν εἴπω οὕτως. So sind sie nicht bloss von B und T überliefert, sowie von W, der nur darin abweicht, dass er sie vor κεφαλῇν stellt, sondern auch von dem Oxyrhynchus-Papyrus. Stephanus und Ast glaubten sie hinnehmen zu können, doch nur, indem sie sie aus ihrer Stelle nach vorwärts schoben und mit der einschliessenden Frage verbanden [Schanz: ἐὰν εἴπω οὕτως (vel potius ἐὰν δὲ εἴπω) ante ἄρα transposuit Stephanus ἐὰν εἴπω οὕτως post ἄρα transposuit Ast]. Friedrich A. Wolf hat sie ausgestossen. Ihm folgen Schanz und Burnet. Winckelmann hat aus ἐὰν εἴπω ein ἀνεῖπὼν gemacht, und diese Abänderung ist in der Tat bestechend. Hermann hat sie aufgenommen und Wilamowitz (*Platon* II, 360) hält damit die Stelle für geheilt. Doch war sie der heilenden Hand wirklich bedürftig? Ist es unbedingt nötig zu ändern? Riddell in dem "Digest" seiner Apologie-